NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FRANCISCO MARTINEZ SIFUENTES; MARIA MARGARITA QUINONES,	No. 04-73368
Petitioners,	Agency Nos. A75-764-718
v.	A75-764-719
ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General,	MEMORANDUM *
Respondent.	

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted July 24, 2006 **

Before: ALARCÓN, HAWKINS, and THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Francisco Martinez Sifuentes and his wife, Maria Margarita Quinones,

natives and citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of Immigration

Appeals' ("BIA") June 7, 2004 order denying their motion to reconsider its March

---

*   This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be
cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

**   The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without
oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

31, 2004 order denying their motion to reopen removal proceedings. To the extent

we have jurisdiction, it is conferred by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of

discretion the denial of a motion to reconsider, *see Oh v. Gonzales*, 406 F.3d 611,

612 (9th Cir. 2005), and we deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for

review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Petitioners' motion to

reconsider because the motion failed to identify any error of fact or law in the

BIA's prior decision denying their motion to reopen. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(1),

(c)(1); *Socop-Gonzalez v. INS*, 272 F.3d 1176, 1180 n.2 (9th Cir. 2001) (en banc).

We lack jurisdiction to review the BIA's March 31, 2004 order denying

Petitioners' motion to reopen, and its January 28, 2004 order affirming the

immigration judge's denial of relief, because Petitioners failed to timely petition

this court for review of those decisions. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS,* 94 F.3d

1256, 1258 (9th Cir. 1996).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.